IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) CRIMINAL CASE NO. 04-00038 | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Plaintiff, | Garapan, Saipan Friday, August 5, 2005 | | | | |
| VS. |)) | | | | |
| ERIC JOHN TUDELA MAFNAS and, CHARLEY K. PATRIS, |) REPORTER'S PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF) WITNESS JOSEPH AUTHER'S TESTIMONY) FILED | | | | |
| Defendants. | Clerk District Court | | | | |
| | AUG 8 2005 | | | | |
| | For The Northern Mariana islands | | | | |
| | (Deputy Clerk) | | | | |
| BEFORE THE HONORABLE A. WALLACE TOSHIMA SENIOR CIRCUIT JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, PRESIDING IN A JURY TRIAL IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS | | | | | |

Assistant United States Attorneys

| 18 | | MARIANAS DISTRICT |
|----|--------------------|--|
| 19 | | Horiguchi Building, Third Floor P. O. Box 500377 |
| 19 | · | Saipan, MP 96950 |
| 20 | | Telephone: (670) 236-2986 |
| 21 | | Facsimile: (670) 236-2945 |
| 22 | For Defendant | Stephanie Flores & Victorino Torres |
| 00 | Mr. E.J.T. Mafnas: | Attorneys at Law |
| 23 | · | Torres Brothers P.C. |
| 24 | | P. O. Box 501856 Saipan, MP 96950 |
| 25 | | Telephone: (670) 233-5506 |
| | | Facsimile: (670) 233-5510 |

For Plaintiff: Timothy Moran & Jamie D. Bowers

INDEX

PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS DIRECT CROSS

AUTHER, Joseph

Mr. Moran.....3

EXHIBITS

<u>PAGE</u>

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS

6A - Complaint Report, Case No. 02-011523. Previously. ..20
7A - Complaint Report, Case No. 02-010450. Previously ..20
8A - Complaint Report, Case No. 02-010450. Previously ..20

For Defendant

Mr. C.K. Patris:

Perry Inos

Attorney at Law P. O. Box 502017 Saipan, MP 96950

Telephone: (670) 235-9006 Facsimile: (670) 235-9007

Also Present:

Defendants Mafnas & Patris

Joseph Auther, Special Agent, FBI, case agent &

Eric Gregoire, Computer Technical Assistant,

U.S. Attorney's Office

SANAE N. SHMULL Official Court Reporter P. O. BOX 5128 **SAIPAN, MP 96950**

GARAPAN, SAIPAN, FRIDAY, AUGUST 5, 2005 - 1:30 P.M.

(This partial transcript of witness Joseph Auther's testimony on direct examination begins as follows:)

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORAN:

- Q Okay, and there's another call with a dot next to it further down the page. Can you see that one?
- A Yes, I can.
- Q Explain what that call is.
- A That's a phone call from the K.P Company phone to Detective Mafnas that was made on 5/13/2003, so May 13, 2003 at 8:31:18, so 8:31 a.m. And that call was for a duration of 33 seconds.
- Q What happened on May 13, 2003 that's relevant to this case?
- A That was the day that Detective Mafnas checked the Chizua ice out of the evidence room.

MR. MORAN: If I might have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes.

- Q BY MR. MORAN: Let me get that exhibit out of your way. Now, Agent Auther, we're now going to move from the drug part of this case to the next part of the case so to speak. Now you mentioned that you spoke to the defendants about this case.
- A Yes, I did.

A Yes, I did.

Q What did you say about that?

I told him that we were executing a search warrant, cause I — the search was going on simultaneously with the interview. So some agents were all doing a search while myself and another agent were interviewing the defendants. But I explained to Detective Patris that there was an investigation into some missing drug evidence and we had heard that he might have some information regarding it.

- Q Did you tell him what drug evidence you were looking for?
- A Uh, I, I don't know that I -- I believe I told him it had to do with the Manabu Chizuwa case, yes.
- Q So what did you ask him?
- A So I asked him if he had any idea what happened to the drugs from the Manabu Chizuwa case.
- Q And what did he say?
- A He told me that he witnessed Detective Mafnas burn the ice in a drum barrel, 55-gallon barrel at the SIS Offices on Capitol Hill.
- Q What was your reaction to that? What did you --
- A I told him that that didn't sound right, that it sounded ridiculous. And I tried to explain to him that in my experience as an FBI agent, if you're going to destroy drugs, or if you're going to destroy any evidence, you usually don't do it before the suspect is

even pled -- is even sentenced; and you don't destroy something like drugs by burning them in a trash can; and that you don't do it without documenting what you did through either some photographs or a written report or some kind of basis or explanation, for the destruction, indicating some evidence that it was destroyed; and that I really found it to be -- I think my words were, I think I told him several times, "Your story is ridiculous and I don't believe that you burned those drugs because you would not, as an experienced officer, you would not destroy evidence in a drug investigation before the defendant had even been sentenced, and that he still had an opportunity to appeal his conviction."

- Q And you told him that it was ridiculous, that you found this very ridiculous and you didn't believe him. What did he say in response?
- A He reiterated that he had witnessed Detective Mafnas burn the drugs. And I asked him, "What did they look like? How do you know that the drugs that Detective Mafnas burned were the drugs from the Chizuwa case?"
- Q Did he tell you how he knew that they were the Chizuwa drugs?
- A Yes, he did.
- Q What did he say?
- A He said that he recognized the packaging. And I said, "What do

8 9

10 11 12

13 14

15

17

16

18 19

21

20

22 23

24 25 you mean you recognize the packaging?" He said that he observed that the drugs that were burned in the trash barrel were identical to the drugs and the way they were packaged on the date that he took part in the search and seizure of that drug evidence from Chizuwa's vehicle.

- These were the Chizuwa's ice that he was there when the Chizuwa's ice was seized, that it was, it looked the same when the defendant Mafnas burned it as it looked when it was seized.
- And that's how he knew it was the same drugs.
- Did he say whether or not he saw the ice being lit on fire?
- I don't know if he said he saw when it got lit, but he said he saw it burning and being put into the trash can.
- But he said he saw it being put into the trash can.
- Α Yes.
- Did he say, did he say why they did it?
- He said that they were given or told by a former Assistant Attorney General Don Wolfe to destroy the ice.
- Did he say when Assistant Attorney General Wolfe had told him to do that?
- He couldn't remember the date, but he told me he knew sometime earlier than 2003, and that to his recollection it was in a context of a meeting that he and Detective Mafnas had with Mr. Wolfe in Mr. Wolfe's office where there was a conversation about the Chizuwa plea

Agreement.

- Q Did he say he was also present for that conversation?
- A He said it was just Eric and Mr. Wolfe.
- Q Did he say whether David Hutton was present for that conversation?
- A No, he did not.
- Q So he did not say that David Hutton was present.
- A That's correct.
- Q Did he say anything else about that conversation with Don Wolfe?
- A He told me that following this discussion about the Chizuwa plea agreement, there was some discussion, as I recall, about whether that was a fair plea agreement, that maybe they should have been more aggressive and taken Mr. Chizuwa to trial on a distribution count instead of just possession. So there was some discussion about that. He told me that following that, the discussion turned to what to do with the evidence, that the topic of destroying, that the Assistant Attorney General Mr. Wolfe told them, "destroy the drugs," and he gave them -- Assistant Attorney General Wolfe gave them a letter authorizing the destruction of the drugs.
- Q Did he say whether he'd seen the letter?
- A Yes, he did.
- Q And had he?

| A | Не | did, | he | told | me | he | saw | the | letter |
|---|----|------|----|------|----|----|-----|-----|--------|
|---|----|------|----|------|----|----|-----|-----|--------|

- Q This is during a conversation with, between the defendants

 Mafnas and Patris and just Don Wolfe that they discussed the plea

 agreement, and during that conversation, Wolfe told them to destroy

 the ice.
- A Correct.

- Q And that's when, according to defendant Patris, Wolfe gave them a letter authorizing the destruction of the ice.
- A Correct.
- Q And what did he say that they did with that letter?
- A He said they took that letter over to the DPS evidence room and gave it to Johannes Taimanao.
- Q So immediately following the conversation that they said they took, that Patris said they took the letter to Johannes Taimanao.
- A Yes.
- Q And what was your reaction to all of this about Don Wolfe? What did you tell the defendant Patris?
- A I told him I talked to Don Wolfe and Don Wolfe said there wasn't, that he would never authorize anyone to destroy the Chizuwa ice. He had never authorized anyone to destroy anything.
- MS. FLORES: Objection, Your Honor. Don Wolfe's statement would be hearsay. Don Wolfe had already testified previously, that

the jury will remember what Don Wolfe had testified to.

MR. MORAN: Your Honor, he's --

THE COURT: No, --

MR. MORAN: He's recounting a statement that he made to the defendant Patris.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. This statement is admitted only for the purpose of explaining the context in which a further statement may have been made by the defendant Patris in reaction to what this witness said that he was told by Don Wolfe. And it's not admitted to prove the truth of the statement made.

Go ahead and finish your statement.

Q BY MR. MORAN: I'm sorry. You were going to tell, tell us what you told the defendant Patris.

THE WITNESS: So I told, I told Detective Patris --

A Yes, I told Detective Patris that I spoke with Don Wolfe and Don Wolfe told me he never authorized the destruction of the Chizuwa ice.

Q And what was the defendant's response to that?

A He continued to maintain that he had seen a letter authorizing the destruction of the drugs. And during the course of the interview, I even told him that, "If there was just some administrative mess up where you checked out the drugs to take it to court and you lost it or something like that happened, the FBI is not

going to put you in jail. But if you continue to say that you 1 destroyed it and it turns out you didn't destroy it, you know, it 2 3 could be a federal offense. And if you want to change your story or think about this, if it was just a mess up on your part or Eric's 5 part, tell me because then it might just be an administrative 6 problem. You might be suspended, but you're probably not going to go to jail." But he continued to say that, "I witnessed Detective Mafnas 8 9 put the ice in a trash can and burn it." 10

- Q Now you also interviewed Detective Mafnas; is that correct?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q On the same day?
- A Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Who was present when you interviewed the defendant Mafnas?
- A Just FBI Agent Daina McMahon.
- Q And what happened during that conversation? What did you say to, to the defendant Mafnas?

A The two interviews were very similar. I started out explaining to Detective Mafnas that, "We're here to investigate some missing drug evidence from the Manabu Chizuwa case." We started out talking about, was he familiar with that case, was he familiar with the drugs. He told me he knew about the case. He was, you know, had worked on it. He told me that there had been a discussion about the

| 1 | |
|---|--|
| | |
| 2 | |

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24

25

plea arrangement (sic) with Assistant Attorney General Wolfe, and after that discussion, he got a letter authorizing the destruction of the ice. He --

- So he said that Assistant Attorney General Wolfe discussed destroying the ice during the same discussion in which they all discussed the plea agreement.
- Yes.
- Who did he say was present for the discussion of the plea agreement?
- Uh, just Detective Patris.
- And Don Wolfe.
- And Don Wolfe.
- And they got the letter from Don Wolfe, he said, during that conversation.
- Yes. Α
- And what did he say they did with that letter?
- He said he took the letter to the evidence custodian Johannes Taimanao.
- Straight to, straight to Johannes Taimanao.
- Uh, yeah, I think he -- I don't remember if he told me he took it right then or if he took it there the next day. I think he took it there right after the meeting. I'd have to refresh my memory from

my report.

- Q Would you like to see your, that --
- A Sure. Okay.
- Q Is your memory refreshed?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay, let me take that back. So what did he do with the -- what did he say that he did with the letter?
- A He said that he could not remember if he took the letter that day or the following day, but that he did take the letter to Johannes Taimanao to acquire the drugs.
- Q So he said he took the letter authorizing the destruction of drugs to Johannes Taimanao either the same day as the discussion of the plea agreement or the next day.
- A Correct.
- Q What did he say happened to the drugs.
- A He said he took the drugs up to his office on Capitol Hill. He placed them in a file cabinet where they remained, he thinks, until the following day.
- Q And then what did he say that he did with the drugs?
- A He said the next day he took the drugs from the file cabinet and got Detective Patris, told him he was going to go burn them in a trash can, and he went outside and placed them in a big 55-gallon

metal drum can with trash in it, placed them in there, lit the rubbish -- papers and what not that were in the trash can -- on fire and burned the ice.

- Q Did he say whether he showed the drugs to the defendant Patris?

 A Uh, he said he -- again, I don't remember if he, I mean, he told me that he got Detective Patris to witness the burning of them. So he --
- Q But he said that --
- A -- had to show it to him.
- Q -- that Patris saw him burn the drugs.
- A Correct.

- Q What did you say to the defendant about the story when you were interviewing him?
- A I told Detective Mafnas the same thing I told Detective Patris that, "You guys are veteran police officers. You know you're not going to destroy drugs in a criminal case where the defendant had just pled guilty and haven't even been sentenced. You know from your experience he can appeal those convictions, that conviction. And no attorney general is going to authorize you to destroy the evidence."

 And I asked him, "Have you ever destroyed drug evidence before?" And he said, "No." I said, "All of a sudden, now you decide you're going to destroy drug evidence for the first time in your history of being

a police officer?" And he just --

- Q What did he say in response?
- A He just said, "yeah, I was told to destroy them so I destroyed them."
- Q Did you ask him about DPS policy about destroying evidence?
- A Yes.

- Q What did he say in response to that?
- A He said he was not aware of any policy.
- Q Did you explain to him that you were investigating the disappearance of those drugs for the FBI?
- A Yes.
- Q What did you say about that?
- A I told him -- again, it was very similar to my discussion with Detective Patris. I said, "Lying to an FBI agent is a federal crime. You don't need to do this. If you just messed up, if you lost the drugs, if there's an innocent explanation for this and you're embarrassed or you're afraid of being punished or suspended, it's a lot better than turning this into a major federal criminal case where you could go to jail. So just tell me now what happened to those drugs, and you're probably not going to be in as big a trouble as if you continue to lie to me, and if we find out that those drugs were not burned."

Q And what did he say in response?

A He continued, he was adamant. "I had permission to destroy those drugs, and I took them to the Capitol Hill Office and put them in a trash can and burned them."

MR. MORAN: If I might have one moment, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.

- Q BY MR. MORAN: Agent Auther, when did this investigation first start at the Attorney General's Office?
- A My understanding -- they called me on -- well, the search warrant was served December 22, 2003. So I got involved, they called me probably December 20th. I know we met maybe once or twice and then executed the search warrant. But I think they were working on it for maybe several days prior to even calling me.
- Q So how much time had passed when it was first known that the drugs were missing and your interview with the defendants?
- A I, I'd estimate about one week.

MR. MORAN: I've nothing further with this witness right now, Your Honor, but we do intend to recall him later in the trial.

THE COURT: I understand. It's about five minutes to 3:00 so we might as well -- we'll take our afternoon recess before we get on with further examination of this witness. So the jury is now excused for the afternoon recess.

Agent Auther, stay in the witness box because we're going to take up these exhibits.

(Jury excused.)

You may be seated. The only matter I want to take up is I reserved ruling on, I think, three exhibits that government offered, right? I think they were 6A, 7A, and 8A. What's your argument on that? Let's hear -- Mr. Moran, let's hear from you first.

MR. MORAN: Your Honor, pursuant to Rule 803, these are admissible both as public records and as business records.

THE COURT: Where did they come from now?

MR. MORAN: They're generated by DPS. The witness testified that they're generated in the normal course of business immediately after the event that they're -- and they're normally maintained in the regular course of business.

THE COURT: No, no, no. But, Agent Auther, what did you do?
You went over to the DPS to get them; is that what happened?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. So you're offering them as public records?

MR. MORAN: Or as business records, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. What's your objection?

MS. FLORES: Your Honor, in order for it to come in as a

business record, we would have to have somebody testify that they work at DPS, that it's maintained in their regular course of business, not for Mr. Auther to --

THE COURT: What about --

MS. FLORES: -- to say what the regular course --

THE COURT: What about --

MS. FLORES: -- of business is.

THE COURT: What about a public record?

MS. FLORES: Well, Your Honor, there's a specific except — these are records maintained by a law enforcement organization, and there's a specific exception under Rule 803(8) as to, in criminal matters, uh, matters observed by police officers are not, are not allowed to come in under public records. And so that's what this complaint, report would be, as matters observed by police officers.

MR. MORAN: Your Honor, the exception that Ms. Flores is referring to in 803(6) refers, it goes to police reports. Those are matters that are observations. This is merely an administrative number, a recording of the case number. This is an administrative record. The police department does, as a business or as any other agency does, maintain administrative records. And those can be qualified as business records. In addition, there's no requirement under the rule that the person who created the record has to qualify

them. It's sufficient so long as a witness can testify that they were created in the normal course of business and were maintained in that way. And since Mr. Auther was present when they were printed out, he can certainly testify as to the manner in which they were maintained.

MS. FLORES: Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: No, no, no. But that's different than being there when it's pulled out of the file cabinet, right? I don't think that's --

MR. MORAN: Basically if it's printed out, it's the same as pulling it out yourself.

THE COURT: But anyway, what else?

MS. FLORES: I disagree, Your Honor. I believe that in order -- I'm not saying that the person that actually generated this has to be here, but at least a custodian of records from DPS would have to come and say that, "yes, this is the type of record that we maintain in the ordinary course of our business." And for it to be a business record, it should come in that way.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to overrule the objection. I'm going to admit Exhibits 6A, 7A, and 8A as public records. I agree with Mr. Moran that these are really administrative matters. They're not like, you know, the 302 police reports where there's a

narrative of what happened and who said what and who did what; but they're just administrative reports of regularly conducted activities. So on that basis, I admit 6A, 7A, and 8A. All right?

(Government's Exhibits 6A, 7A, and 8A received.)

MR. FLORES: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else to take up?

MS. FLORES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes?

MS. FLORES: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead. You may step down, Agent Auther.

MS. FLORES: We understand that they're not going to ask Agent Auther any further questions at this time. However, this witness does have further testimony that he'll be, he will be providing throughout the trial.

THE COURT: That's what Mr. Moran --

MS. FLORES: We would request that his entire --

THE COURT: That's what Mr. Moran said.

MS. FLORES: -- testimony be --

THE COURT: You request what?

MS. FLORES: We request that he complete his entire testimony that he's going to give.

THE COURT: What's the reason for that?

3

4

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MS. FLORES: To have him testify to his testimony? THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. FLORES: We would request that if he's going to be testifying once that he sit up there and testify completely, and then we get a chance to cross-examine him just one time.

THE COURT: Well, you'll get a chance to cross-examine him two times. I don't understand the reason for the request. So it doesn't make too much sense to me, so it's overruled. I think, you know, either side should be allowed to present their evidence in the, in the order they think is --

MS. FLORES: Okay, that's fine then, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- is best for them.

MS. FLORES: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, anything else?

MR. MORAN: Not from the government, Your Honor.

MS. FLORES: No.

MR. INOS: No.

THE COURT: All right, let's take the remainder of our recess.

(Court recessed at 3:00 p.m., Friday, August 5, 2005.)

COMMONWEALTH OF THE)

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS)

SAIPAN, MP)

I, SANAE N. SHMULL, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, do hereby certify:

ss.

That the foregoing partial transcript of witness FBI Special Agent Joseph Auther's trial testimony in Criminal Case No. 04-00038, United States of America v. Eric John Tudela Mafnas and Charley K. Patris, consisting of 21 pages plus 1-index page, was taken down by me stenographically with a back-up tape recording device at the time and place indicated herein.

That the foregoing expedited transcript is a true and correct record of the proceeding transcribed by me to the best of my ability at the request of Assistant United States Attorney Timothy Moran.

I further certify that I am not interested in the events of the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name and signature this 6th day of August 2005.

SANAE N./SHMULL
Official Court Reporter